MMR

MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY WEEKLY REPORT

- 49 Measles Los Angeles County, California, 1988
- 57 Yellow Fever Virus Activity Trinidad and Tobago
- 59 Update: Influenza United States, 1988–89 Season


Current Trends

Measles - Los Angeles County, California, 1988

A provisional total of 513 confirmed cases of measles was reported from Los Angeles County during 1988 (Figure 1). The Los Angeles County cases represent 17.5% of all (2933) cases reported for the United States during this period and an incidence rate of 6.4 cases/100,000 persons—a risk 5.3 times higher than that in the rest of the United States (1.2/100,000). In early 1988, school-aged children and adults were predominantly affected. However, in May, both the number and proportion of cases reported among children <5 years of age increased, prompting a more intense investigation. The following analysis is based on the provisional total of 355 persons with confirmed cases having onset from May 1 to December 31.

Of 353 confirmed patients with known ages and onset from May 1 to December 31, 228 (64.6%) were <5 years of age (Table 1). A total of 135 (38.2%) were <16 months of age (i.e., too young for routine vaccination), including 87 (24.6%) <12 months of age; 93 (26.3%) were 16 months to 4 years of age. Infants <12 months of age had the

FIGURE 1. Confirmed measles cases, by month of rash onset and patient age — Los Angeles County, California, 1988



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES / PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

highest reported age-specific incidence rate (66.9/100,000) (Table 1). Race/ethnicity was known for 331 (93.2%) patients; of these, 257 (77.6%) were Hispanic. The risk for measles for Hispanics (11.3/100,000) was 3.6 times that for black non-Hispanics (28 cases; 3.1/100,000) and 12.6 times that for white non-Hispanics (31 cases; 0.9/100.000).

Preventability status* was known for 353 (99.4%) of the cases; 150 (42.5%) of these were preventable, and 203 (57.5%) were considered programmatically nonpreventable. However, among the 90 vaccine-eligible preschoolers aged 16 months to 4 years for whom preventability status was known, 77 (85.6%) had preventable measles. Of the 203 patients with nonpreventable illnesses, 135 (66.5%) were in children younger than the recommended age for routine vaccination, and 50 (24.6%) were in previously vaccinated persons. Of the remaining 18 (8.9%) patients with nonpreventable measles, five had a philosophic exemption or a medical contraindication to receiving the vaccine, and 13 were born before 1957.

The setting of transmission was known for 209 (58.9%) patients, of whom 120 (57.4%) had known household exposures to measles. Sixty-three (30.1%) acquired measles in medical settings, where transmission occurred both among and between patients and personnel. Transmission also occurred in day-care centers, schools, and colleges.

One hundred twenty-two (34.4%) patients were hospitalized. The reported age-specific hospitalization-to-case rate was similar for infants (43.7%) and preschoolaged children (1–4 years of age) (38.3%), slightly lower for adults ≥20 years of age (32.7%), and lowest for persons 5–19 years of age (17.1%). Of the 355 patients, 60 (16.9%) had diarrhea, 37 (10.4%) had otitis media, 35 (9.9%) had pneumonia, three (0.8%) had encephalitis, and two (0.6%) had meningitis. One adult patient with hemophilia and human immunodeficiency virus-related illness was probably exposed to measles at the medical center where he was employed. His course was complicated by pneumonia, respiratory failure, and encephalitis, but he recovered after treatment with intravenous immune globulin and ribavirin.

TABLE 1. Age distribution and incidence rates of reported measles cases — Los Angeles County, California, May 1, 1988–December 31, 1988*

Age group (yrs)	No.	(%)	Rate [†]
<1	87	(24.6)	66.9
1–4	141	(39.9)	27.3
5–9	37	(10.5)	6.6
10–19	33	(9.3)	2.6
≥20	55	(15.6)	1.0
Total (age known)	353	(100.0)	_
Age unknown	2	_	_
Total	355	_	4.4

^{*}Number and proportion of patients <5 years of age increased in May.

^{*}According to the CDC classification, a case is considered preventable if measles illness occurs in a U.S. citizen 1) at least 16 months of age, 2) born after 1956, 3) lacking adequate evidence of immunity to measles (documented receipt of live measles vaccine on or after the first birthday, or physician-diagnosed measles disease), 4) without a medical contraindication to receiving vaccine, and 5) with no religious or philosophic exemption under state law (1).

[†]Cases/100,000 population (1985 population estimates).

Two measles-associated deaths occurred for a reported death-to-case ratio of 5.6/1000 cases. One death occurred in an 8-month-old infant, the other in a 23-month-old unvaccinated child. Both patients had nosocomially acquired cases and were exposed to measles while hospitalized for other illnesses.

On July 21, the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services lowered the minimum age for measles vaccination to 12 months. Media announcements informed the public of measles transmission in Los Angeles County, and parents were urged to have their children vaccinated. The health department also recommended that 1) medical facilities, including emergency rooms (ERs), vaccinate measles-susceptible patients between 12 months and 4 years of age seen for any reason, unless a valid contraindication to vaccination exists; 2) ER staff promptly screen patients and isolate those suspected of having measles; and 3) medical staff without evidence of immunity to measles and who have patient contact be vaccinated.

Reported by: G Lentini, P Heseltine, MD, Los Angeles County/Univ of Southern California Medical Center, Los Angeles; J Amling, E Evashwick, Childrens' Hospital, Los Angeles; E Smith, Kaiser-Bellflower Hospital, Bellflower; SH Waterman, MD, PD Frederick, MPH, County of Los Angeles Dept of Health Svcs; L Dales, MD, D Lyman, MD, State Epidemiologist, California Dept of Health Svcs. Div of Immunization. Center for Prevention Svcs. CDC.

Editorial Note: Measles transmission in preschool-aged children remains a major impediment to elimination of measles in the United States (2). Measles epidemiology in Los Angeles County is similar to that of other recent inner-city measles outbreaks among preschoolers in low socioeconomic groups in which most affected persons were unvaccinated (2–4). To improve vaccine coverage in high-risk children <15 months of age, the Immunization Practices Advisory Committee (ACIP) recently recommended that public health officials in areas with recurrent measles transmission lower the minimum age for routine vaccination to 9 months of age (5). Children vaccinated before their first birthday should receive single-antigen measles vaccine and be revaccinated with measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine (MMR) at 15 months of age. An alternate strategy is to lower the age for routine vaccination to 12 months using one dose of MMR.

Lowering the minimum age for vaccination is an important adjunct to control measles transmission among children younger than the routine age for vaccination. However, the large percentage (77.8%) of vaccine-eligible patients 16 months to 4 years of age who were unvaccinated demonstrates the need for intensive efforts to increase vaccine coverage in this hard-to-reach group. Thus, long-term outreach programs are needed for parents and children in low socioeconomic groups in urban areas. Programs should emphasize the following:

- Barriers to obtaining immunizations (e.g., physical or sociocultural) should be minimized, for example, by providing vaccination clinics on weekends and during evening hours convenient to families needing these services;
- Local community leaders and health officials should collaborate to promote age-appropriate vaccinations and use of existing public health systems;
- Community settings, such as church groups, schools, and mobile vans in neighborhoods, should be considered for vaccine delivery and health education programs.

Such outreach efforts may improve vaccination levels, decrease measles transmission, and promote regular preventive health care.

In Los Angeles County and other areas with recent measles outbreaks in the United States, multiple settings of transmission have been identified (2–4). Exposure to measles in medical settings has been important in perpetuating measles transmission (2–4,6). While most of the transmission in medical settings involved preschoolaged children, medical personnel have also been affected. The ACIP recommends that hospitals and other medical facilities ensure that personnel at risk for occupational exposure to measles be immune (7). A survey conducted in 1985–86 indicated that only eight of the 147 acute-care hospitals in Los Angeles County had mandatory policies requiring employees to provide documentation of measles immunity (Immunization Unit, California Department of Health Services, unpublished data). In Los Angeles County, three medical centers reported nearly half (169) of the 355 measles cases with onset from May 1 to December 31, 1988, including one center that accounted for more than one fourth (96) of all cases. Two of these centers have instituted policies for employees at risk for exposure to measles.

The risk for measles transmission was even more likely to be high in Los Angeles County because the inner-city Hispanic community (which was the major focus of

(Continued on page 57)

TABLE I. Summary - cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States

		ng	Cumulative, 4th Week Ending					
Jan. 28, 1989	Jan. 30, 1988	Median 1984-1988	Jan. 28, 1989	Jan. 30, 1988	Median 1984-1988			
279 73	U* 105	206 94	2,110 247	1,879 302	857 319			
5 1	4	18 2	27 5	57 5	57 5			
245	216	361	711	833	64,851 1,337			
366	337	433	1,189	1,156	1,387 1,539			
57	49	72	145	130	227 271			
-	-	3	5	4	54 15			
11	36	27	114	82	42 71 67			
2	-	1	8	2	8 199			
116	78 28	60	338 144	255 70	240 107			
5 757	3 826	3 670	12 2,283	13 2,515	21 2,042			
6 6	4 6	3 6	21 16	14 18	13 19			
321 1	4	2	5	14	1,048 7			
2 2 84	16 6 73	6 1 73	14 6 216	22 6 183	22 5 247			
	279 73 5 1 12,439 245 661 366 30 57 9 - 11 11 9 2 45 116 36 36 36 37 57 66 6321 1 2 2	279 73 105 5 18 1 2439 12,439 12,439 245 216 661 434 366 337 30 36 57 49 9 15 11 11 11 36 2 - 11 11 11 36 2 - 45 85 116 78 36 28 57 37 57 826 6 6 321 349 1 4 2 16	279 U* 206 73 105 94 5 18 18 1 4 2 12,439 12,943 17,208 245 216 361 661 434 434 366 337 433 30 36 60 57 49 72 9 15 15 11 11 36 27 11 36 27 9 36 26 2 - 1 45 85 58 116 78 60 36 28 33 757 826 670 36 6 6 31 349 369 1 4 2 2 16 6 2 6 1	279 U* 206 2,110 73 105 94 247 5 18 18 27 1 4 2 5,110 12,439 12,943 17,208 45,188 245 216 361 711 661 434 434 1,985 366 337 433 1,189 30 36 60 138 57 49 72 145 9 15 15 41 1 11 12 52 111 36 27 114 9 36 26 106 2 - 1 8 45 85 58 153 116 78 60 338 36 28 33 144 5 36 38 33 144 5 36 6 6 6 338 36 28 33 144 5 36 6 6 6 338 36 28 33 144 5 36 6 6 6 338 36 28 33 144 5 36 6 6 6 338 36 28 33 144 5 36 6 6 6 338 36 28 33 144 5 36 28 33 144 5 37 22 5 5 3 3 3 12 757 826 670 2,283 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 321 349 369 1,172 1 4 2 5 5 2 16 6 6 14 2 1 6 6 6 14	279 U* 206 2,110 1,879 73 105 94 247 1,879 5 18 18 27 57 12,439 12,943 17,208 45,188 53,944 245 216 361 711 833 661 434 434 1,985 1,343 306 337 433 1,189 1,156 30 36 60 138 138 57 49 72 145 130 9 15 15 41 54 11 11 12 52 37 11 36 27 114 82 9 36 26 106 80 2 - 1 8 2 45 85 58 153 243 16 78 60 338 255 36 28 33 1			

TABLE II. Notifiable diseases of low frequency, United States

	Cum. 1989		Cum. 1989
Anthrax Botulism: Foodborne Infant Other Brucellosis Cholera Congenital rubella syndrome Congenital syphilis, ages <1 year Diphtheria	- - - - - - -	Leptospirosis (Hawaii 6) Plague Poliomyelitis, Paralytic Psittacosis (N.C. 1, Ala. 1) Rabies, human Tetanus (Fla. 1, Ala. 1) Trichinosis	11 - - 6 - 5

^{*}Because AIDS cases are not received weekly from all reporting areas, comparison of weekly figures may be misleading.

†There were no cases of internationally imported measles reported for this week.

TABLE III. Cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending January 28, 1989 and January 30, 1988 (4th Week)

		Aseptic	Encep	halitis			Н	lepatitis	(Viral), by	type	F	
Reporting Area	AIDS	Menin- gitis	Primary	Post-in- fectious	(Civ	orrhea ilian)	Α	В	NA,NB	Unspeci- fied	Legionel- losis	Leprosy
	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1988	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989
UNITED STATES	2,110	247	27	5	45,188	53,944	1,985	1,189	138	145	41	5
NEW ENGLAND	132	20		-	1,590	1,576	54	94	14	7	4	-
Maine N.H.	5 2	1	-	-	27	33	1	4	2	-	-	-
Vt.	2	1	-	-	9 7	31 15	13 1	7 2	3 2	1 -	-	-
Mass.	71	10	-	-	604	503	26	63	5	5	3	-
R.I. Conn.	7 45	3 5		-	99 844	100 894	13	14 4	1	1	1	-
MID. ATLANTIC	616	14	1		3,237	7,701	443	219	17	18	12	1
Upstate N.Y.	79	9	i	-	643	756	112	53	7	1	3	-
N.Y. City N.J.	333 136	5	-	-	698	3,200 893	8 66	35 51	2 4	9 5	-	-
Pa.	68	-		-	1,896	2,852	257	80	4	3	9	1
E.N. CENTRAL	214	43	12	-	8,834	8,569	94	130	9	2	11	-
Ohio	17	15	4	-	2,224	1,801	49	58	2	-	9	-
Ind. III.	53 85	4	1	-	610 3,089	631 2,585	3 2	7 2	-	-	-	-
Mich.	49	23	7	-	2,629	2,841	36	54	7	2	1	-
Wis.	10	1	-	•	282	711	4	9	-	-	1	-
W.N. CENTRAL Minn.	54	6	-	-	2,240	2,010	20	17	5	-	-	-
lowa	9	4	-	-	198 174	257 188	3	5 3	2	-	-	-
Mo.	35	2	-	-	1,339	1,222	9	9	1	-	-	-
N. Dak. S. Dak.	1 2	-	-	-	5 24	23 41	-	-	2	-	-	-
Nebr.	-	-	-	-	191	78	3	-	-	-		-
Kans.	7	-	-	-	309	201	2	-	-	-	-	-
S. ATLANTIC	370	57	3	2	14,045	13,953	148	222	15	29	4	-
Del. Md.	11 52	4 6	-	-	201 1,409	228 1,211	5 28	11 46	4	8	3	-
D.C.	37	-	-	-	921	835	-	-	-	-	-	-
Va. W. Va.	26 1	16 1	1 2	-	1,261 151	1,230 143	6 2	23 3	1	17	1	-
N.C.	1	11	-	1	2,071	1,647	58	82	10	-	-	-
S.C. Ga.	16	2	-	-	1,653 2,385	1,215 2,900	3 31	20 9	-	2	-	-
Fla.	80 146	4 13	-	1	3,993	4,544	15	28		1 1	-	-
E.S. CENTRAL	41	23		_	4,549	4,156	29	120	18	1	3	_
Ky.	10	8	-	-	373	365	12	32	6	-	1	-
Tenn. Ala.	20	5 9	-	-	1,280 1,594	1,272 1,520	8 5	54 33	4 8	1	1 1	-
Miss.	11	ĭ	-	-	1,302	999	4	1	-		-	-
W.S. CENTRAL	187	6	3	-	5,160	7,430	73	20	4	6	4	-
Ark.	6	-	:	-	535	420	5	-	-	-	-	-
La. Okla.	19	1 4	1 2	-	765 554	2,363 440	1 40	1 14	1	•	4	-
Tex.	162	1	-	-	3,306	4,207	27	5	3	6	•	-
MOUNTAIN	49	9	1	-	662	1,129	389	72	15	17	1	-
Mont. Idaho	1	-	-	-	15	27	4	11 6	-	-	-	-
Wyo.	3	-	-	-	17 9	25 13	25 5	1	-	-	-	-
Colo.	3	1	-	-	46	292	38	7	2	7	-	-
N. Mex. Ariz,	4	2 4	:	-	86 306	122 390	34 208	13 18	2 3	8	1	-
Utah	8	2	1	-	50	44	28	6	5	2	-	-
Nev.	30	-	-	-	133	216	47	10	3	-	•	-
PACIFIC	447	69	7	3	4,871	7,420	735	295	41	65	2	4
Wash. Oreg.	61 26	-	-	-	219 214	473 244	35 96	7 17	5	1		-
Calif.	359	66	5	3	4,299	6,530	513	266	35	62	2	4
Alaska Hawaii	-	-	2	-	114	101	83	4	1	2	-	-
	1	3	-	-	25	72	8	1	-	-	•	-
Guam P.R.	103	9	-	-	- :	13 113	3	8	-	2	-	-
V.I.	15	-	-	-	31	28	-	-	-	-		-
Amer. Samoa C.N.M.I.	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
O. 1. 191.1.	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE III. (Cont'd.) Cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending January 28, 1989 and January 30, 1988 (4th Week)

			Meas	les (Rub	eola)		Menin-								
Reporting Area	Malaria	Indig	enous	Imported*		Total	gococcal Infections	Mu	mps	Pertussis			Rubella		
	Cum. 1989	1989	Cum. 1989	1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1988	Cum. 1989	1989	Cum. 1989	1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1988	1989	Cum. 1989	Cum 1988
UNITED STATES	52	9	106	2	8	82	153	116	338	36	144	70	5	12	13
NEW ENGLAND	3	-	-	-	-	1	15	-	2	-	9	5	-	-	-
Maine N.H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3	-	2	-	2 5	1 2	-	-	-
Vt. Mass.	3	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	:		:	-	-	-	-
R.I.	•	•		-	-	-	1	-	•	-	2	:	-	-	-
Conn.		-		•		-	. 1	-	-	•		2	-	•	-
MID. ATLANTIC Upstate N.Y.	9 5	1	2	-	1 -	16	14 5	-	11	3 2	16 2	3 1	-	1	-
N.Y. City N.J.	1	-	1	•	1	-	2	-	7	1	13	•	•	-	7
Pa.	3	1	1	-	·	16	7		4	-	1	2		-	-
E.N. CENTRAL	5	-	44	•	1	1	14	4	25	2	3	7	-	-	5
Ohio Ind.	3	-	44	-	1 -	-	8 -		8	-	1	:	-	-	-
III. Mich.	-		-	•	-	1	4	4	17	2	2	3 3	-	-	5
Wis.	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	•	''-	-	-	1	-		-
W.N. CENTRAL	-	-	10	2	2	-	4	20	102	-	2	12	-		-
Minn. Iowa	-	-	-	-	-	:	-	-	3	-	2	3	-	-	:
Mo.	•	-	10	-	-	:	•	20	20	-	-	-	-	-	-
N. Dak. S. Dak.	:	:	-	:	-	-	1	-		-	-	6 2	-	:	-
Nebr. Kans.		:	-	- 2§	2	-	3	-	- 79	-	-	1	-	-	-
S. ATLANTIC	7	1	2		1	2	28	10	51	_	2	11	•	-	-
Del.		1	-	-		-	-		-	-	•	'n	-		-
Md. D.C.	4		2	:	1	1	6 4	2	27 2	-			-	:	-
Va. W. Va.	2	:	-	-	-		4 2	8	16 2	:	1	1	-	-	-
N.C.	•	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	2	-	1	5	-	-	-
S.C. Ga.	:	:	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	:	-	3	-	•	-
Fla.	1	•	-	-	-	•	7	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
E.S. CENTRAL Ky.	2	-	1 -	-	-	:	10 8	12 9	23 9	3	7	3	-	-	-
Tenn.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	12	2	2	2	-	:	-
Ala. Miss.	2	-	1 -	-	-	-	2	N	2 N	1	5	1	-	-	-
W.S. CENTRAL		-	-	-	2	-	8	58	82	1	1		_		_
Ark. La.	•	-	-	-	2	-	1	5 7	12 10	1	1	-	-	-	-
Okla.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	36	40	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tex.	-	-	-	-		-	5	10	20	-	-	•	-	-	•
MOUNTAIN Mont.	6 -	-	13 12	:	1 1	27 -	4	3	6	20	76 -	11	-	-	1
ldaho Wyo.	3	-	-	-	-	-	:	-	1	5	5	7	-	-	-
Colo.	-	-	-	-	-	27	2	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	•
N. Mex. Ariz.	1 1	-	1	-	-	:	2	N 2	N 3	15	1 68	1	-	-	-
Utah	1	-		•	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ż	-	-	
Nev. PACIFIC	20	7	34	-	-	35	56	9	36	7	1 28	-	-	-	1
Wash.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	28 1	18 2	5	11	7
Oreg. Calif.	20	7	34	-	-	35	4 49	N 9	N 32	7	27	7	- 5	11	7
Alaska		-	-	-	-	•	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	''-	<i>'</i> -
Hawaii	•	U	-	U	-	-	•	U	2		-	9		-	-
Guam P.R.	-	9	10	-	-	:	1	-	-	U	:	-	U	-	-
V.I. Amer. Samoa	:	Ū	-	Ū	-	:	-	Ū	2	Ū	-	-	Ū	-	-
C.N.M.I.	-	ŭ	-	ŭ	-	-	-	ŭ		ŭ	-	-	ŭ	-	-

*For measles only, imported cases includes both out-of-state and international importations.

N: Not notifiable U: Unavailable †International *Out-of-state

TABLE III. (Cont'd.) Cases of specified notifiable diseases, United States, weeks ending

	January 28, 1989 and January 30, 1988 (4th Week)													
Reporting Area	Syphilis (Primary &	(Civilian) Secondary)	Toxic- shock Syndrome	Tuber	culosis	Tula- remia	Typhoid Fever	Typhus Fever (Tick-borne) (RMSF)	Rabies Anima					
	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1988	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1988	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989	Cum. 1989					
UNITED STATES	2,283	2,515	16	1,172	993	5	14	6	216					
NEW ENGLAND	164	57	1	31	16	-	6	-	_					
Maine	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-					
N.H. Vt.	-	1	-	4 1	-				:					
Mass.	52	25	-	5	7	-	1	•	-					
R.I. Conn.	31 81	29	•	9 11	1 8	-	4 1	-	-					
								-						
MID. ATLANTIC Upstate N.Y.	355 23	527 24	3	267 10	264 43	1	4	1	50					
N.Y. City	198	365	1	196	143	-	3	-	-					
N.J. Pa.	113 21	48 90	2	29 32	40 38	1	1	ī	- 50					
						,								
E.N. CENTRAL Ohio	67 4	68 5	2 2	150 33	148 28	-	1	1 1	6					
Ind.	3	9	-	6	3	-		•	-					
HI.	52	32	-	59	58	-	-	-	2					
Mich. Wis.	8	20 2		49 3	52 7	-	1		1 3					
W.N. CENTRAL	29	11	1	34	27			1	13					
Minn.	1	'1	-	9	7	-	-	<u>'</u>	5					
lowa	6	1	-	6	3	-	-	1	-					
Mo. N. Dak.	13	3	•	7 2	9 1	-	-	-	2 2					
S. Dak.		1 -	1	3	7	-			-					
Nebr.	9	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	2					
Kans.	-	3	-	6	•	-	-	-	2					
S. ATLANTIC	878	842	2	186	203	-	•	1	66					
Del. Md.	5 25	14 40	-	11	3 25	-	-	1	17					
D.C.	72	21	•	15	-6	-	-	-	''-					
Va.	46	26	-	29 5	23 6	-	-	-	17					
W. Va. N.C.	2 48	1 51	2	16	9	-	-	-	6					
S.C.	56	33	-	36	35	-	-	•	15					
Ga.	206	136	-	13	14	•	-	-	11					
Fla.	418	520	-	61	82	-	-	-	-					
E.S. CENTRAL Ky.	178 4	156 2	-	84 34	111 40	1	-	2 2	12 6					
Tenn.	56	51	-	16	18	-	-	-	-					
Ala.	68	60	-	33	44	-	-	-	6					
Miss.	50	43	-	1	9	-	-	-	-					
W.S. CENTRAL	295 25	308	•	53	54	1	-	-	35					
Ark. La.	60	38	-	4 7	19	-	-	-	2					
Okla.	4	13	•	-	11	1	-	-	5					
Tex.	206	257	-	42	24	-	-	-	28					
MOUNTAIN	21	65	3	34	17	-	-	-	7					
Mont. Idaho	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	6					
Wyo.	-	-		-	-	-	-		-					
Colo.	2 1	12	1	:	5	-	-	-	-					
N. Mex. Ariz.	14	7 11	1 1	8 24	4 6		-	-	1					
Utah	4	3	-		-		-	-						
Nev.	-	32	-	2	2	-	-	-	-					
PACIFIC	296	481	4	333	153	2	3	-	27					
Wash. Oreg.	15	14 11	-	12	13	-	•	-	-					
Calif.	281	453	4	9 296	10 114	2	3	-	19					
Alaska			-	4	3	•	-	-	8					
Hawaii	-	3	-	12	13	-	-	-	-					
Guam	-	_ :	-	-	-	-		-	-					
P.R. V.I.	1	52 1	-	6	6	-	•	-	2					
Amer. Samoa	-	<u>'</u>	-				-							
C.N.M.I.	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-						

TABLE IV. Deaths in 121 U.S. cities,* week ending January 28 1989 (4th Week)

New New Canage Page	January 28, 1989 (4th Week)															
New Reporting Area														P&I**		
Bridgeport, Conn. 26 17 5 2 1 1 4 Baltimore, Md. 166 105 34 21 1 5 8 8 15 3 2 Charbridge, Mass. 18 15 3 2 Charbridge, Mass. 18 15 3 2 Charbridge, Mass. 29 22 6 - 1 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 29 22 6 - 1 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 29 22 6 - 1 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 20 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 20 4 Morfolk, Va. 62 38 14 6 - 4 4 6 6 105 107	Reporting Area		≥65	45-64	25-44	1-24	<1	1	I Reporting Area		≥65	45-64	25-44	1-24	<1	Total
Bridgeport, Conn. 26 17 5 2 1 1 4 Baltimore, Md. 166 105 34 21 1 5 8 8 15 3 2 Charbridge, Mass. 18 15 3 2 Charbridge, Mass. 18 15 3 2 Charbridge, Mass. 29 22 6 - 1 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 29 22 6 - 1 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 29 22 6 - 1 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 20 - 2 Charbridge, Mass. 20 4 Morfolk, Va. 62 38 14 6 - 4 4 6 6 105 107														29		
Cambridge, Mass. 18 15 3 2 Charlotte, N.C. 10 3 2 6 64 24 10 3 3 2 6 6 13 4 - 6 6 6 1 15 3 2 3 2 3 2 Miami, Fila. 192 6 6 3 3 4 - 6 6 6 1 15 3 2 3 2 3 2 Miami, Fila. 192 73 23 23 23 3 - 1 Lovell, Mass. 39 34 3 2 4 Norfolk, Va. 16 2 3 3 5 Miami, Fila. 192 73 23 23 23 3 - 1 Lovell, Mass. 39 34 3 2 4 Norfolk, Va. 16 2 3 3 5 Miami, Fila. 192 73 23 23 23 3 - 1 Lovell, Mass. 39 34 3 2 4 Norfolk, Va. 16 2 3 3 5 Miami, Fila. 192 73 23 23 23 3 - 1 Lovell, Mass. 39 34 3 2 4 Norfolk, Va. 16 2 3 3 5 Miami, Fila. 192 75 3 3 4 16 6 4 28 9 3 4 16 Norfolk, Va. 16 2 76 15 1																
Fall River, Mass. 29 22 6 - 1 - 2 Jacksonville, Fila. 98 65 26 3 4 - 6 Hartford, Conn. 84 61 15 3 2 3 2 Jacksonville, Fila. 98 65 26 3 4 - 6 Hartford, Conn. 84 61 15 3 2 3 2 Jacksonville, Fila. 98 65 26 3 3 4 - 6 Hartford, Conn. 84 61 15 3 2 3 2 Jacksonville, Fila. 98 65 26 38 14 6 - 4 6 Lovell, Mass. 30 3 3 4 3 2 Richmond, Va. 108 64 28 9 3 4 16 6 - 4 6 Rev. Martford, Conn. 44 29 6 4 2 3 5 St. Hortford, Va. 108 64 28 9 3 4 16 6 - 4 6 Rev. Martford, Conn. 44 29 6 4 2 3 5 St. Hortford, Va. 108 64 28 9 3 4 1 1 3 Rev. Haven, Conn. 44 29 6 4 2 3 5 St. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Providence, R.I. 64 43 2 1 7 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Providence, R.I. 64 43 2 1 7 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 7 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 76 Rev. Heatsburg, Fila. 102 72 Rev. Heat																
Lowell, Mass. 39 34 3 2 4 Norfolk, Va. 62 38 14 6 4 6 New Bedford, Mass. 30 20 6 - 3 1 7 Richmond, Va. 108 64 28 9 3 4 16 New Bedford, Mass. 30 20 6 - 3 1 7 Richmond, Va. 108 64 28 9 3 4 16 New Bedford, Mass. 30 20 6 - 3 1 7 Richmond, Va. 108 64 28 9 3 4 16 New Bedford, Mass. 30 20 6 - 3 1 7 Richmond, Va. 108 64 28 9 3 4 16 1 3 1 5 Savannah, Ga. 42 30 7 3 1 1 1 3 New Haven, Conn. 44 29 6 4 2 3 5 St. Petersburg, Fla. 102 76 15 5 - 6 100 Providence, R.I. 64 43 20 1 7 Richmond, Va. 108 64 8 8 9 4 3 5 Springfield, Mass. 64 45 10 3 1 5 1 Willington, Dc. 197 97 41 20 3 35 Sc. Petersburg, Fla. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 New Haven, Conn. 27 18 8 1 1 - 1 5 1 Willington, Dc. 197 97 41 20 3 35 Sc. Petersburg, Fla. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 New Haven, N.Y. 46 28 9 4 3 2 2 5 Sk. Petersburg, Fla. 102 76 15 5 6 10 New Haven, N.Y. 46 28 9 4 3 2 2 5 Sk. Petersburg, Fla. 102 76 New Haven, N.Y. 102 65 24 9 3 3 1 15 Sk. Petersburg, Fla. 103 3 10 9 5 5 4 Richmond, Pa. 19 16 3 1 Louisville, Ky. 188 116 76 0 9 10 New Haven, N.J. 43 20 2 1 1 1 4 Minimagton, N.Y. 102 65 24 9 3 3 1 15 Memphis, Tenn. 204 141 39 16 5 3 326 Richmond, N.J. 43 39 2 2 1 1 1 4 Minimagton, N.Y. 102 65 24 9 3 3 1 15 Memphis, Tenn. 204 141 39 16 5 3 326 Richmond, N.J. 43 31 2 25 5 Richmond, N.J. 43 31 2 25 5 Richmond, N.J. 44 18 4 12 1 6 Memphis, Tenn. 204 141 39 16 5 3 326 Richmond, N.Y. 102 65 3 - 1 1 1 1 Richmond, Minimagton, N.Y. 102 65 24 9 3 3 1 15 Memphis, Tenn. 204 141 39 16 5 3 326 Richmond, N.J. 43 15 245 49 54 69 W.S. CENTRAL 1.967 1.245 398 188 63 63 98 Newwark, N.J. 61 28 14 12 1 6 3 Newbrille, Tenn. 75 51 20 2 1 1 1 7 Richmond, N.J. 40 10 Newbrak, N.J. 61 30 12 Newbrak, N.J. 61 30 12 Newbrak, N.J. 61 30 Newbrak, N.J. 61 30 12 Newbrak, N.J. 61 30				6				2		98		26	3	4	-	6
Lynn, Mass. 18									Miami, Fla.					3	-	
New Berdford, Mass. 30				3		-	-	4					6	- 2		
New Haven, Conn. 44 29 6 4 2 3 5 5 St. Petersburg, Fla. 102 76 15 5 - 6 10 Providence, Rl. 64 43 20 1 - 2 Tampa, Fla. 81 48 15 8 6 4 8 Somerville, Mass. 5 3 2 Tampa, Fla. 81 48 15 8 6 4 4 8 Somerville, Mass. 64 45 10 3 1 5 11 Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 6 6 Springfield, Mass. 65 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 6 Somerville, Mass. 65 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 6 Somerville, Mass. 66 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 6 Somerville, Mass. 66 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 5 Somerville, Mass. 66 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 5 Somerville, Mass. 66 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 5 Somerville, Mass. 66 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 5 Somerville, Mass. 66 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 5 Somerville, Mass. 66 57 6 1 - 1 5 II Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 5 Somerville, Mass. 48 10 10 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Lynn, Mass.			6		3	1	-								
Providence, R.I. 64 43 20 1 2 Tampa, Fla. 81 48 15 8 6 4 8 5 5 3 2 Washington, D.C. 197 97 41 20 3 35 6 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	New Haven, Conn.				4									-		
Springfield, Mass. 64 45 10 3 1 5 11 Willimigton, Del. 29 24 3 2	Providence, R.I.				1	-		2	Tampa, Fla.							
Waterbury, Conn. 27 18 8 1 1 2					-	1		11						3	35	6
Worcester, Mass. 65 57 6 1 1 - 1 5 E.S.CENIRAL 892 93 131 10 9 5 5 4 5 MID. ATLANTIC 3,207 2,043 609 360 90 103 169 Chattanooga, Tenn. 68 48 14 3 1 2 5 Albany, N.Y. 46 28 9 4 3 2 2 5 Louisville, Ky. 188 116 47 6 10 9 10 Birmingham, Ala. 153 98 31 10 9 5 5 4 MID. ATLANTIC 3,207 2,043 609 360 90 103 169 Chattanooga, Tenn. 68 48 14 3 1 2 5 Albany, N.Y. 102 65 24 9 3 1 15 Louisville, Ky. 188 116 47 6 10 9 10 Birminghis, Tenn. 204 141 39 16 5 3 26 Camden, N.J. 43 26 8 1 1 2 6 - Mobile, Ala. 28 14 6 4 1 3 3 - Erie, Pa.† 55 39 9 2 1 1 4 5 Nashville, Tenn. 128 92 27 4 4 1 1 5 Jersey City, N.J. 50 34 9 5 - 2 1 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. 1,014 31 25 Albany N.Y. 1,01	Springtield, Mass.								1 -							
MID. ATLANTIC 3,207 2,043 609 360 90 103 169 Chattanooga, Tenn. 68 48 14 3 3 1 2 5 5 Albany, N.Y. 46 28 9 3 4 3 2 2 2 Knovville, Tenn. 75 51 20 2 1 1 1 7 7 1 1 1 7 7 1 1 1 7 7 1 1 1 1	Worcester, Mass.				1	-	1	5								
Albany, N.Y., Y.Y., Albany, N.Y., Albany, N.Y., Albany, N.Y., Y.Y., Albany, N.Y., Alba		3 207	2.043	609	360	90	103	169							2	
Allentown, Pa. 19 16 3 1 Louisville, Ky. 188 116 47 6 10 9 10 Mobile, Allan. 204 141 39 16 5 3 26 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 4 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 - 4 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 4 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 - 4 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 4 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 4 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 4 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 4 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 3 3 - 2 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 6 6 4 1 1 1 5 Mobile, Allan. 28 14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Albany, N.Y.			9				2							1	7
Camden, N.J. 43 26 8 1 2 6 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Allentown, Pa.				-	-	:		Louisville, Ky.						9	
Elizabeth, N.J. 24 20 2 1 1 1 - 4 Montgomery, Ala. 5 48 35 9 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						3		15								26
Erie, Pa.† 55 39 9 2 1 1 4 5 Jersey City, N.J. 50 34 9 5 - 2 1 Jersey City, N.J. 50 34 9 5 - 2 1 Jersey City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,677 1,014 315 245 49 54 69 Newark, N.J. 61 28 14 12 1 6 3 Jersey City, N.J. 30 25 3 - 1 1 1 Jersey City, N.J. 30 25 3 - 1 1 1 Jersey City, N.J. 30 25 3 - 1 1 1 Jersey City, N.J. 30 25 3 - 1 1 Jersey City, N.J. 30 25 3 - 1 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 42 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 - 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 25 4 2 2 Jersey City, N.J. 31 3 3 Jersey City, N.J. 31 3 Jers							-	4								1
Jersey City, N.J.			39	9		1							4			
N.Y. City, N.Y. 1,6/7 1,014 315 243 459 548 549 549 549 211 221 6 3 3 4 3 548 549 211 221 6 3 3 4 3 548 548 548 7 7 4 3 2 2 3 3 5 548 548 7 7 4 3 2 3 3 5 548						-	2		W.S. CENTRAL	1.967	1.245	398	198	63	63	98
Paterson, N.J. 30 25 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		1,677					54 6		Austin, Tex.							
Philadelphia, Pa. 597 379 126 49 21 20 22 Corpus Christ, 1ex. 3 8 37 10 1 1 1 2 13 Pittsburgh, Pa. 68 44 18 4 - 2 3 3 Reading, Pa. 42 38 2 1 1 - 7 8 Reading, Pa. 42 38 2 1 1 - 7 7 8 7 8 Reading, Pa. 42 38 2 1 1 - 7 7 8 7 8 Reading, Pa. 42 38 2 1 1 - 7 8 Reading, Pa. 42 38 6 Reading, Pa. 42 38 6 Reading, Pa. 42 3 1 5 4 2 7 Reading, Pa. 42 38 6 Reading, Pa. 42 3 1 5 4 2 7 Reading, Pa. 42 3 1 5 4 2 7 Reading, Pa. 42 3 1 5 4 2 7 Reading, Pa. 42 3 1 5 4 2 7 Reading, Pa. 42 3 1 7 7 4 1 8 8 6 Reading, Pa. 42 1 1 1 4 8 8 6 Reading, Pa. 42 1 1 1 4 8 8 6 Reading, Pa. 42 1 1 1 4 8 8 6 Reading, Pa. 42 1 1 1 8 8 9 1 177 7 3 1 - 8 Reading, Pa. 42 1 1 1 8 8 9 1 177 7 3 1 - 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					12				Baton Rouge, La.			7		3	2	
Pittsburgh, Pa.1 68 44 18 4 - 2 3 Institute of the part of the	Philadelphia, Pa.		379			21	20							-	- 10	
Reading, Pa. 42 58 2 1 1 2 4 8 6 Rochester, N.Y. 118 91 17 7 3 3 - 8 Schenectady, N.Y. 311 25 4 2 8 Caranton, Pa.† 29 22 5 4 2 7 Houston, Tex.\$ 734 436 169 89 24 16 18 Schenectady, N.Y. 31 25 4 2 7 Houston, Tex.\$ 734 436 169 89 24 16 18 Caranton, Pa.† 29 22 5 2 7 Houston, Tex.\$ 734 436 169 89 24 16 18 Caranton, Pa.† 29 22 5 2 7 Houston, Tex.\$ 734 436 169 89 24 16 18 Caranton, Pa.† 29 22 5 2 7 Houston, Tex.\$ 734 436 169 89 24 16 18 Caranton, Pa.† 29 22 5 2 7 Houston, Tex.\$ 734 436 169 89 24 16 18 Caranton, Pa.† 29 22 5 16 4 1 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4	Pittsburgh, Pa.†					:										
Schenetady, N.Y. 31 25 4 2 7									Fort Worth, Tex							
Scranton, P8.1 29 22 5 2 7 Little Rock, Ark. 57 38 7 7 4 1 4 4 1 4 5 5 1 5 4 3 3 9 5 5 4 1 7 11 4 1 4 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 5 1 1 1 5 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 1						-			Houston, Tex.§					24		
Syracuse, N.Y. 94 69 15 4 3 3 9 San Antonio, Tex. 264 182 48 16 5 13 21 Trenton, N.J. 47 25 16 4 1 1 - - 1 The reveport, La. 66 43 15 1 3 4 4 Yonkers, N.Y. 57 40 9 7 - 1 7 The reveport, La. 66 43 15 1 3 4 4 E.N. CENTRAL 2,506 1,663 518 175 72 78 143 MOUNTAIN 825 548 156 71 23 27 65 Akron, Ohio 48 37 7 2 2 - 10 Hueson, Molo 182 174 44 4 4 4 4 15 4 4 10 2 16 10 20 16 10 20	Scranton, Pa.†	29	22	5		_	_									4
Trenton, N.J. 47 25 10 4 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 3 4 4 4 1 1 1 3 4	Syracuse, N.Y.						3									21
Otica, N.Y. 17 40 9 7 - 1 7 Tulsa, Okla. 114 78 23 9 2 2 13 Yonkers, N.Y. 57 40 9 7 - 1 7 Tulsa, Okla. 114 78 23 9 2 2 13 MOUNTAIN 825 548 1566 71 23 27 65 Akron, Ohio 62 36 15 3 4 4 7 6 7 2 2 - 10 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 3 7 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 1 3 7 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 1 3 7 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 1 3 7 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 1 3 7 7 1 4 4 1 4 1 3 7 7 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 1 3 7 7 1 1 4 4 1 1 3 7 7 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 1 3 7 7 1 1 4 4 1 1 3 7 7 Colo. Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 1 3 7 1 2 2 1 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Trenton, N.J.				•	1					43	15		3	4	
E.N. CENTRAL 2,506 1,663 518 175 72 78 143 MUUNIAIN 825 548 106 71 23 27 65 Akron, Ohio 62 36 15 3 4 4 - Albuquerque, N. Mex. 108 74 20 9 3 2 7 7 Akron, Ohio 648 37 7 2 2 2 - 10 Clock Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 3 7 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Clockago, Ill.\$ 567 29 15 2 2 10 Clockago, Ill.\$ 567 29 20 Clockago, Ill.\$	Utica, N.Y.					-			Tulsa, Okla.	114	78	23	9	2	2	13
Akron, Ohio 62 36 15 3 4 4 - Albuquerque, N. Mex. 108 74 20 9 3 2 7 Canton, Ohio 48 37 7 2 2 - 10 Clots Springs, Colo. 57 37 10 6 1 3 7 Canton, Ohio 48 37 7 6 3 30 Las Vegas, Nev. 115 67 29 15 2 2 10 Clots Chicanati, Ohio 195 145 34 7 6 3 30 Las Vegas, Nev. 115 67 29 15 2 2 10 Clots Chicanati, Ohio 182 117 44 14 4 3 3 Clots Chicanati, Ohio 182 117 44 14 4 3 3 Clots Chicanati, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Phoenix, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Columbus, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Phoenix, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Columbus, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Phoenix, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Phoenix, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 7 1 17 Evansville, Ind. 73 51 14 4 1 3 7 Tucson, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Fort Wayne, Ind. 76 55 15 4 1 1 5 PACIFIC 2,342 1,598 405 204 66 57 194 Grand Rapids, Mich. 66 47 14 3 - 2 1 1 Berkeley, Calif. 21 14 5 1 - 3 1 Grand Rapids, Mich. 86 47 14 3 - 2 7 9 1 Glendale, Calif. 30 26 2 2 - 1 1 Madison, Wis. 32 18 7 4 2 1 1 Madison, Wis. 32 18 7 4 2 1 1 Madison, Wis. 128 96 22 3 3 3 4 9 Long Beach, Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Madison, Wis. 128 96 22 3 3 3 4 9 Long Beach, Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Peoria, Ill. 53 33 10 2 - 8 6 Los Angeles Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Count Bend, Ind. 135 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 135 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 1 7 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 1 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3			1 663	518	175	72	78	143								
Canton, Ohio 48 37 7 2 2 - 10 Denver, Colo. 130 86 24 10 2 8 7 Chicago, IIII.§ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Chicago, III.§ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Chicago, III.§ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Chicago, III.§ 567 29 15 2 2 10 Chicago, III.§ 567 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20						4		-							2	7
Chicago, III.\$ 564 362 125 45 10 22 16 Cincinnati, Ohio 195 145 34 7 6 6 3 30 Poden, Utah 23 17 3 - 2 1 4 4 14 4 3 3 Poden, Utah 23 17 3 - 2 1 4 4 14 4 14 4 15 1 Pueblo, Colo. 15 10 3 2 - 2 2 Poetroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Tucson, Ariz. 188 117 18 5 7 1 17 Evansville, Ind. 73 51 14 4 1 3 7 Pueblo, Colo. 15 10 3 2 2 - 2 Poetroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Tucson, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Evansville, Ind. 73 51 14 4 1 3 7 Packet, Vision 11 8 8 3 1 18 Packet, Vision 12 Packet, Vision 12 Packet, Vision 13 Packet, Vision 13 Packet, Vision 14 18 15 1 - 1 Packet, Vision 15 Packet, Vision 15 Packet, Vision 15 Packet, Vision 15 Packet, Vision 16 Packet, Vision 17 Packet, Vision 17 Packet, Vision 18 Packet, Vision							.:									
Cleveland, Ohio 182 117 44 14 4 3 3 3 Ogen, Utan 23 17 3 - 2 1 4 Columbus, Ohio 122 74 34 8 2 4 10 Open, Color, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Columbus, Ohio 122 74 85 20 7 8 4 10 Open, Color, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Columbus, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Open, Color, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Columbus, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Open, Color, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Columbus, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Open, Color, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Columbus, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Open, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Columbus, Ohio 126 81 150 59 40 13 6 1 Columbus, Ohio 127 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 128 150 59 40 13 6 1 Columbus, Ohio 129 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 - 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 3 2 2 Columbus, Ohio 120 7 9 1					45		22								2	
Columbus, Ohio 122 74 34 8 2 4 - Phoenix, Ariz. 186 113 40 21 4 8 11 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 1 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 50 7 Detroit, Mich. 27 Detroit, Mich. 2	Cincinnati, Ohio						3		Ogden, Utah	23	17	3	-	2	1	4
Dayton, Ohio 124 85 20 7 8 4 10 Tucson, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 1 7 Tucson, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Fort Wayne, Ind. 76 55 15 4 1 1 1 5 PACIFIC 2,342 1,598 405 204 66 57 194 Gary, Ind. 11 8 3 1 Berkeley, Calif. 21 14 5 1 - 1 - 1 Grand Rapids, Mich. 66 47 14 3 - 2 9 Holding of the Calif. 101 76 16 1 3 5 9 Indianapolis, Ind. 181 115 44 9 6 7 6 Glendale, Calif. 30 26 2 2 1 Madison, Wis. 32 18 7 4 2 1 1 Madison, Wis. 32 96 22 3 3 3 4 9 Milwaukee, Wis. 128 96 22 3 3 3 4 9 Milwaukee, Wis. 128 96 22 3 3 3 4 9 Rockford, III. 53 33 10 2 - 8 6 Rockford, III. 53 33 10 2 - 8 6 Rockford, III. 53 33 30 3 5 - 1 1 7 Rockford, III. 53 33 30 3 5 - 1 1 7 Rockford, III. 53 33 30 3 3 5 - 1 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 3 3 5 - 1 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 39 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 30 3 5 5 - 1 7 Rockford, III. 30 30 43 12 7 9 9 22 Rockford, III. 30 43 12 7 9 9 22 Rockford, III. 30 43 12 7 9 9 22	Columbus Ohio					2	4	-						4	8	
Detroit, Mich. 268 150 59 40 13 6 7 Tucson, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Evansville, Ind. 73 51 14 4 1 1 3 7 Tucson, Ariz. 148 117 18 5 7 1 17 Evansville, Ind. 76 55 15 4 1 1 1 5 PACIFIC 2,342 1,598 405 204 66 57 194 Gary, Ind. 67 14 3 - 2 9 Parkeley, Calif. 21 14 5 1 - 1 - 1 - Gary, Ind. 181 115 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Mich. 5 181 115 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 115 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 15 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 44 9 6 7 6 Grand Rapids, Ind. 181 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Pacific Rapids, Ind. 181 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Pacific Rapids, Ind. 181 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Pacific Rapids, Ind. 181 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Pacific Rapids, Ind. 181 125 89 30 3 3 5 - 1 7 Pasadena, Calif. 182 38 6 3 2 - 5 South Bend, Ind. 183 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 135 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 185 125 125 89 24 11 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 180 55 17 3 4 1 7 Pasadena, Calif. 204 130 43 12 7 9 224		124												2	2	
Evansville, Ind. 73 51 14 4 1 1 5 Fort Wayne, Ind. 76 55 15 4 1 1 1 5 Fort Wayne, Ind. 76 16 1 3 5 5 15 4 1 1 1 5 Fort Wayne, Ind. 97 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Detroit, Mich.	268				13	9									17
Gary, Ind. Gary, Ind. Grand Rapids, Mich. 5 66 47 14 3 - 2 9 Fresno, Calif. 101 76 16 1 3 5 9 Indianapolis, Ind. Indianapolis, Ind. Isl 115 44 9 6 7 6 Glendale, Calif. 30 26 2 2 - 1 1 Indianapolis, Ind. Madison, Wis. I28 96 22 3 3 4 9 Long Beach, Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Indianapolis, Ind. Milwaukee, Wis. I28 96 22 3 3 4 9 Long Beach, Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Indianapolis, Ind. South Bend, Ind. South Bend, Ind. I35 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. I35 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. I36 101 101 16 11 8 1 1 - 1 20 Indianapolis, Ind. I37 102 103 103 104 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105									1	2 342		405	204	66	57	194
Grand Rapids, Mich. 5 66 47 14 3 6 2 6 7 6 7 6 Fresho, Calif. 101 76 16 1 3 5 9 Indianapolis, Ind. 181 115 44 9 6 7 6 Glendale, Calif. 30 26 2 2 - - 1 Honolulu, Hawaii 91 65 17 4 3 2 10 Milwaukee, Wis. 128 96 22 3 3 4 9 Long Beach, Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Peoria, III. 67 48 12 4 1 2 6 Los Angeles Calif. 51 344 89 52 19 3 24 Rockford, III. 67 48 12 4 1 2 6 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9				3	-	-	-		Berkeley, Calif.					-		-
Indianapolis, Ind. 181 115 44 9 0 7 0 Olerania, Idam. 30 26 2 2 2 1 Madison, Wis. 32 18 7 4 2 1 1 Honolulu, Hawaii 91 65 17 4 3 2 10 Madison, Wis. 128 96 22 3 3 4 9 1 Long Beach, Calif. 125 89 24 11 1 23 Rockford, III. 53 33 10 2 - 8 6 Los Angeles Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Rockford, III. 67 48 12 4 1 2 6 Oakland, Calif. 514 344 89 52 19 3 24 Rockford, III. 39 30 3 5 - 1 7 7 Pasadena, Calif. 49 38 6 3 2 - 5 South Bend, Ind. 135 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Sacramento, Calif. 204 130 43 12 7 9 22	Grand Rapids, Mich.			14		-	2		Fresno, Calif.					3	5	
Madison, Wis. 32 96 22 3 3 4 9 Long Beach, Calif. 125 89 24 11 - 1 23 Meoria, III. 53 33 10 2 - 8 6 Los Angeles Calif. 514 344 89 52 19 3 24 Rockford, III. 67 48 12 4 1 2 6 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 South Bend, Ind. 39 30 3 5 - 1 7 Pasadena, Calif. 49 38 6 3 2 - 5 Toledo, Ohio 135 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Veteroration Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Sacramento, Calif. 204 130 43 12 7 9 22		181							Glendale, Calif.					-	-	
Milwaukee, Wis. 53 33 10 2 - 8 6 Los Angeles Calif. 514 344 89 52 19 3 24 Peoria, III. 67 48 12 4 1 2 6 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Ind. 39 30 3 5 - 1 7 Pasadena, Calif. 49 38 6 3 2 - 5 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 7 9 22 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 9 22 Oakland, Calif. 93 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						3								3		
Rockford, III. 67 48 12 4 1 2 6 Oakland, Calif. 92 57 21 7 4 3 9 Rockford, III. 39 30 3 5 - 1 7 Pasadena, Calif. 49 38 6 3 2 - 5 South Bend, Ind. 135 101 19 8 5 2 9 Portland, Oreg. 141 101 16 11 8 4 11 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Sacramento, Calif. 204 130 43 12 7 9 22					2	-						89	52		3	24
South Bend, Ind. 39 30 3 5 1 7 7 Pasadena, Calif. 49 38 6 3 2 1 5 1 Toledo, Ohio 80 55 17 3 4 1 7 Sacramento, Calif. 204 130 43 12 7 9 22		67				1					57				3	
Toledo, Ohio 135 101 19 6 3 2 9 Fortunia, Oreg. 141 101 10 11 6 4 11 10 11 6 11 6 11 6						5			Portland Orga						1	
Voungetourn Ohio 00 00 17	Toledo, Ohio						ī		Sacramento, Calif							
200 144 A7 27 33 51 John Diego, Cain. 202 101 40 17 0 0 0.	Youngstown, Ohio								San Diego, Calif.	232	161	40	17	5	9	31
W.N. CENTRAL 977 / 26 144 47 27 5 6 San Francisco, Calif. 231 130 49 42 3 6 7									San Francisco, Calif.							
Des Moines, Iowa 42 32 6 2 - 2 San Jose, Calif. 198 144 25 19 6 4 28					2	2	-									
Dulutti, Minn. 20 14 5 0 4 3 1 Seattle, Wash. 20 14 5 0 4 5 14 5 0 4 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5		41	26	6												
Kansas City Mo 105 76 21 - Tacoma Wash 49 35 9 4 1 - 3						3	5									
Lincoln, Nebr. 40 38 1 5 5 11 20 TOTAL 14 723 ¹¹ 9 700 2 840 1 275 417 476 936	Lincoln, Nebr.					5	11		· ·			-			476	936
Minneapolis, Minn. 200 64 9 11 2 4 5						2	4	5	1	-,,20	3,700	_,040	.,2,3	717	4, 5	
Omaha, Nebr. 162 122 21 10 4 5 7			122	21			5									
St Paul Minn 85 04 9 3						4	5	1	,							
Gi. Fall, Milli. 38 27 9 2 / Wichita, Kans.§		38	27	9	2	•	-	-								

^{*}Mortality data in this table are voluntarily reported from 121 cities in the United states, most of which have populations of 100,000 or more. A death is reported by the place of its occurrence and by the week that the death certificate was filed. Fetal deaths are not included.

Included.
**Pneumonia and influenza.
**Pneumonia and influenza in reporting methods in these 3 Pennsylvania cities, these numbers are partial counts for the current week.
18 Total includes unknown ages.
11 Total includes unknown ages.
12 Total includes unknown are setimates based on average of past available 4 weeks

тотаl includes unknown agos. §Data not available. Figures are estimates based on average of past available 4 weeks.

this outbreak) seeks routine medical care primarily through hospital ERs, as demonstrated by the number of patients with measles seen in ERs. In addition to increasing vaccination coverage in this hard-to-reach group, vaccinating in ERs may help curtail transmission in these settings. However, in Los Angeles County, programmatic constraints have precluded vaccination of susceptible, vaccine-eligible children in most ERs. Transmission in ERs may also be reduced by prompt screening of patients and isolation of those suspected of having measles, a difficult task since measles patients are infectious during the prodrome of their illnesses before the appearance of rash. This control measure was implemented in hospital ERs in Los Angeles County.

Measles transmission in Los Angeles County also occurred among school-aged persons, another major pattern of transmission in the United States (2,8). During a 5-week period in the fall, 47 students and employees at a university in Los Angeles developed measles. As a result of efforts by the state and county health departments, more than 3700 of the estimated 20,000 students at the university were vaccinated at special on-campus clinics. In addition, officials from the health departments urged the university and all other Los Angeles County colleges and universities to require documentation of both measles and rubella immunity as a prerequisite to matriculation, a recommendation supported by the ACIP (7) and the American College Health Association (9).

References

- CDC. Classification of measles cases and categorization of measles elimination programs. MMWR 1983;31:707–11.
- Markowitz LE, Preblud SR, Orenstein WA, et al. Patterns of transmission in measles outbreaks in the United States, 1985–1986. N Engl J Med 1989;320:75–81.
- 3. CDC. Measles New Jersey. MMWR 1986;35:213-5.
- 4. CDC. Measles Dade County, Florida. MMWR 1987;36:45-8.
- 5. ACIP. Measles prevention: supplementary statement. MMWR 1989;38:11-4.
- Davis RM, Orenstein WA, Frank JA Jr, et al. Transmission of measles in medical settings, 1980 through 1984. JAMA 1986;255:1295

 –8.
- 7. ACIP. Measles prevention. MMWR 1987;36:409-18,423-5.
- Williams WW, Markowitz LE, Cochi SL, et al. Immunizations in college health: the remaining tasks. J Am Coll Health 1987;35:252–60.
- 9. American College Health Association. Position statement on immunization policy. J Am Coll Health 1983;32:7-8.

International Notes

Yellow Fever Virus Activity - Trinidad and Tobago

In December 1988, the Ministry of Health, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Caribbean Epidemiology Center (CAREC) received reports of howler monkeys (*Alouatta* sp.) dying in the Trinity Hills area of the southeastern forests of Trinidad. Surveillance of monkeys in forested areas is a component of the Ministry's ongoing surveillance of sylvatic yellow fever. Field and laboratory investigations did not establish specific evidence of yellow fever in either of two dead monkeys, one decomposing and one freshly shot. However, mosquito surveillance using human landing collections (mosquitoes collected as they landed on humans) yielded two isolates of yellow fever virus from 29 pools of *Haemagogus janthinomys* collected in the forests between

Yellow Fever - Continued

December 8 and January 19. Three additional yellow fever isolates were detected in the same pools.

Surveillance for sick or dying monkeys and of forest mosquitoes was intensified after dying monkeys were reported. Initially, health-care facilities near forested areas were alerted to intensify fever surveillance and to encourage unimmunized persons to be vaccinated; subsequently, however, immunization coverage has been expanded island-wide. In Trinidad and Tobago, although intensified fever surveillance for human cases was implemented when reports of dying monkeys were confirmed, no human cases have been detected. As of February 1, 1989, no yellow fever virus has been isolated from monkeys. A program of local spraying of adulticides, identification and elimination of peridomestic breeding sites for *Aedes aegypti*, and application of larvicides has been initiated in villages near the forest edge. Although virus activity remains confined to one forested area, the Ministry of Health has made a public statement advising visitors to forested areas to be immunized.

No evidence of virus activity in the island of Tobago exists, and the port areas and airports of both islands are free of *Ae. aegypti*. Yellow fever virus has never been isolated from *Ae. aegypti* or mosquitoes in Tobago, and the monkeys and mosquitoes associated with sylvatic yellow fever are not found there.

Through CAREC, national epidemiologists and Pan American Health Organization offices of Caribbean countries, along with the World Health Organization (WHO), have been informed of the situation.

Reported by: M Lewis, RD Deen, Acting Chief Medical Officer, Ministry of Health, Trinidad and Tobago. J Hospedales, B Hull, S Rawlins, Caribbean Epidemiology Center, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. Div of Vector-Borne Viral Diseases, Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC.

Editorial Note: Yellow fever is enzootic in certain sylvatic locations in South America; however, mechanisms underlying the periodic occurrence of epizootic activity in Trinidad are not fully understood—in particular, it is unknown whether the virus is periodically reintroduced from enzootic areas of South America or is maintained in the forest between outbreaks (1,2). Laboratory studies have shown that transovarial transmission of the virus in mosquitoes is possible (2), but in the western hemisphere, the virus has not been demonstrated in mosquitoes collected from sylvatic locations. Collections of ova, larvae, and adult mosquitoes in the affected forest have been planned to investigate the possibility of vertical transmission (2).

Human cases in Trinidad were last confirmed in 1979 when 18 cases were acquired in sylvatic locations. None of these 18 patients were immunized, and no evidence was found of urban spread by *Ae. aegypti*. That outbreak initially was detected in the Trinity Hills area. Following the outbreak in 1979, 80% of the population >1 year of age was immunized in 1979 and 1980. In addition, an ongoing routine immunization program directed at 1-year-old children was implemented in 1979.

Most persons immunized in 1979 remain protected, and the routine immunization of children born after 1979 has resulted in a 70% level of immunity in children <10 years of age. Efforts have been directed toward full immunization coverage of persons who live or work in or near forests where virus activity is occurring. The high level of immunity that exists in the urban population of Trinidad and Tobago reduces the possibility that a sylvan outbreak could develop into an urban epidemic.

CDC recommends yellow fever vaccination for travelers >9 months of age who leave urban areas (3). Since a yellow fever epizootic has not been established, a change in this recommendation for yellow fever vaccine in travelers to Trinidad is not

Yellow Fever - Continued

indicated. A yellow fever vaccine certificate is not required for entry into Trinidad and Tobago except for travelers >1 year of age coming from areas designated by WHO as currently infected with yellow fever.

References

- 1. Downs WG. The known and the unknown in yellow fever ecology and epidemiology. Ecol Dis 1982;1:103–10.
- Aitken THG. Yellow fever: evolution of ideas concerned with demonstrating the natural occurrence of transovarial transmission of virus in mosquitoes. Bull Soc Vector Ecol 1988;13:85–96.
- 3. CDC. Health information for international travel, 1988. Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1988:57; HHS publication no. (CDC)88-8280.

Current Trends

Update: Influenza — United States, 1988–89 Season

Most influenza viruses reported during the 1988–89 influenza season have been type B. However, the number of states reporting influenza A viruses increased substantially from December 31, 1988, to January 31, 1989. Most of the reported influenza A viruses have been subtype H1N1. As of January 27, influenza type B viruses were reported from 38 states*, influenza A(H1N1) from 22 states[†], and influenza A(H3N2) from seven states[§] this season. Each of these influenza viruses have also been reported from the District of Columbia. Outbreaks of influenza-like illness have occurred in schools, universities, nursing homes, and other group-living facilities. Culture-confirmed outbreaks have been associated with influenza B viruses and both subtypes of influenza A viruses.

Reported by: Participating state and territorial epidemiologists and laboratory directors. Influenza Br and Epidemiology Office, Div of Viral Diseases, Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC.

Editorial Note: Virus cultures should be obtained during outbreaks of influenza-like illness to assess the appropriateness of amantadine therapy. Use of amantadine, an antiviral drug effective against only influenza A viruses, may be considered for prophylaxis or treatment of influenza until results of culturing are known (1).

An increased risk for Reye syndrome in children and teenagers when aspirin is used to treat influenza symptoms has been reported in years when type B influenza has predominated (2,3). Parents, teenagers and children who self-medicate, and health-care workers should be aware of this possible serious complication associated with aspirin use.

References

- 1. ACIP. Prevention and control of influenza. MMWR 1988;37:361-4,369-73.
- Hurwitz ES, Barrett MJ, Bregman D, et al. Public Health Service study of Reye's syndrome and medications: report of the main study. JAMA 1987;257:1905


 –11.
- CDC. Reve syndrome surveillance United States, 1986. MMWR 1987;36:689–91.

[†]Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin.

Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, New York, Pennsylvania.

^{*}Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

FIGURE I. Reported measles cases — United States, Week 52, 1988, & Weeks 1-3, 1989



The Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report is prepared by the Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia, and available on a paid subscription basis from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, (202) 783-3238.

The data in this report are provisional, based on weekly reports to CDC by state health departments. The reporting week concludes at close of business on Friday; compiled data on a national basis are officially released to the public on the succeeding Friday. The editor welcomes accounts of interesting cases, outbreaks, environmental hazards, or other public health problems of current interest to health officials. Such reports and any other matters pertaining to editorial or other textual considerations should be addressed to: Editor, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia 30333.

Acting Director, Centers for Disease Control Walter R. Dowdle, Ph.D.

Acting Director, Epidemiology Program Office Michael B. Gregg, M.D.

Editor, MMWR Series Richard A. Goodman, M.D., M.P.H. Managing Editor

Karen L. Foster, M.A.

☆U.S. Government Printing Office: 1989-631-108/81545 Region IV

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service Centers for Disease Control Atlanta, GA 30333

Official Business

Penalty for Private Use \$300

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
PHS/CDC
Permit No. G-284

24 *HCRU9FISD22 8721 DANIEL E FISHBEIN, MD CID, VRL 7-P44 G13 X